UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,274	03/31/2006	Tomio Kajigaya	060187	7459

23850 7590 12/17/2008

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP
1420 K Street, N.W.
Suite 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
SAHA, BIJAY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4181	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,274	KAJIGAYA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BIJAY SAHA	4181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/31/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

The claims 1-4 are pending and presented for the examination.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims **3-4** are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-2 of U. S. Patent No. 7,442,250 (hereafter US '250) since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

Regarding **claims 3-4**, US '250 claims the resistivity range of 10^6 to 10^8 ohm.cm by burying the lithium tantalate crystal in a mixture of aluminum and aluminum oxide. Applicants' claims do not have any specific value or range of either % aluminum or %aluminum oxide; claimed resistivity values are in between 10^8 to 10^{10} ohm cm. Although the reference does not claim more than 10^8, the ranges are close enough that one would not expect a difference in the properties. In re Woodruff 16 USPQ 2nd 1934 and In re Aller USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bordui et al WO 01/33260 A1 (hereafter WO '260).

Regarding **claim 1**, WO '260 discloses lithium tantalate crystal substrate having resistivity in the range of 10^8 to 10^{10} ohm cm (Page 10 Table 1). In view of this, claim 1 is anticipated by the reference.

Regarding **claim 2**, it is to be noted that this is defining process limitations that includes the heat treatment and burying the lithium tantalate crystal in a powder; further, same resistivity anticipates the claimed subject matter. Applicants use process limitations to define the product and "product-by-process" claims do not patentably distinguish the product even though made by a different process. *In re Thorpe* 227 USPQ 964.

Assuming arguendo, it is the examiner's position that the heat history is a function of the temperature used; thus, since the same temperature is apparent, this feature would be inherent absent specific evidence to the contrary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following rejection is an alternative to the one defined above.

Claims **1-2** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bordui et al WO 01/33260 A1 (hereafter WO '260) in view of Furukawa et al JP 63-35499 A (hereafter JP '499).

Regarding **claims 1-2**, WO '260 discloses lithium tantalate crystal grown by the Czochralski method (Page 3 line 29) where the resistivity is altered by heat treatment in the range of 400ºC to 1140ºC (Page 12 Claim 5) under chemically reducing inert

atmosphere comprising argon and nitrogen (Claim 6) to manufacture lithium tantalate substrate having resistivity in the range of 10^8 to 10^{10} ohm cm (Page 10 Table 1).

JP '499 discloses disclose a method of making lithium tantalite crystal where the crystal is placed in a crucible and in a state of being buried in a mixed powder (Page 545 Figure 1) and the crystal is heated up near the temperature range of 750ºC (Page 545) where the powder consists of constituents of aluminum oxide.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to control the resistibility of the lithium tantalate substrate by a heat treatment (WO '260 teaching) by placing the lithium tantalate substrate in a powder containing alumina (JP '499 teaching). The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to alter crystal resistance and associated properties such as opacity and color that affect the utilization of the crystal. Ceramic crystals are sensitive to the impurity diffusion in the bulk solid. A small impurity diffusion significantly alters the physical properties. In this case, by enclosing the crystal in alumina or other oxides such as zirconia or titania (JP '499 teaching) and simultaneous application of temperature and electric field the resistivity can be altered to a wide range. A particular value of resistivity can be selected for a specific application. In MPEP 2144.05 [R-5] Obviousness of Ranges, "In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists"; hence, range of 400ºC to 1150ºC covers the applicant claim of 350ºC to 600ºC.

In view of the above, the resistivity can be altered to a value in the range of greater than 10^8 by selecting experimental conditions that include thermal cycle (time, and temperature) and reduction environment.

Summary

The claims 1-4 are pending and have been examined.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BIJAY SAHA whose telephone number is (571)270-5781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 8:00 a.m. EST - 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on 571 272 0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BIJAY SAHA/
Examiner, Art Unit 4181

/MICHAEL MARCHESCHI/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793